

GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

FEB 8 1924

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVII, No. 15

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1924

WHOLE NO. 465

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Paul Shorey, Managing Editor

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY is a quarterly journal devoted to research in the languages, literatures, history, and life of classical antiquity. Since its beginning in 1906 it has been very popular with scholars of America and Europe. Particularly in America, its influence upon the development of classical study has been pronounced.

Criticisms of current works in its field appear in each issue of the journal. CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY is a magazine for everyone engaged in the study and teaching of the Classics, and for those outside the academic field who are attracted by the civilization of classical antiquity.

A SPECIAL OFFER

To members of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States

Subscriptions will be received from members of the Association at a special discount of one-third the regular rate.

Such subscriptions must be sent through the Secretary of the Association, Professor Charles Knapp, 1737 Sedgwick Ave., New York.

Regular subscription, \$4.00 per year. Single copies \$1.00

Special rate, \$2.67 per year

Canadian postage, 15 cents. Foreign postage 25 cents

The University of Chicago Press

5877 Ellis Avenue

Chicago, Illinois

Reasons for the Great Success of Place's Second Year Latin

THE "Introductory Lessons" and the "Training Camp" pave the way to Caesar's Gallic War. The "Introductory Lessons" lay stress on the syntactical principles not covered in First Year Latin, which need to be known for the intelligent reading of Caesar. Each lesson ends with an easy Latin story.

The "Training Camp" is an intensive study of the first twenty chapters of the "Gallic War"—each treated by itself with a preliminary review, a special vocabulary study, and a summary of grammatical principles.

The text consists of the most significant parts of the first seven books of "The Gallic War".

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

A sound and concise Latin grammar, for the high-school pupil and for the college undergraduate

D'OOGE'S CONCISE LATIN GRAMMAR

The high-school pupil finds here the essential facts stated clearly and prominently on an open page. He finds that advanced material has been reduced to smaller type or has been relegated to footnotes. The college undergraduate finds here all that is needed for translation of authors usually read in college. He finds a convenient and authoritative check upon those fundamentals learned in the secondary school.

GINN AND COMPANY

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

LONDON

ATLANTA

DALLAS

COLUMBUS

SAN FRANCISCO

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVII, No. 15

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1924

WHOLE NO. 465

BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE OCTOBER 23, 1831—JANUARY 9, 1924

The death of Professor Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, on January 9, is an event in the history of American scholarship. Ten years younger than March, four years younger than Whitney, born in the same year as Goodwin, he felt strongly the impulse that, in the days before our Civil War, sent so many young and ambitious American students to Germany, then in the full current of that scientific study of ancient life and language which had set in at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Here, after having drunk deep of the strong enthusiasm of the great teachers and investigators of that day, these young men returned to America to take leading parts in the movement which was ultimately to give the United States a rank in classical scholarship quite on a level with that of the Old World, and which gave the first clear evidence of its existence in the formation of the American Philological Association, in 1868, and finally showed itself fully developed in the establishment of The Johns Hopkins University, in 1876.

There had been graduate study in the United States before 1876, but it was with the opening of The Johns Hopkins University that graduate study as distinct from undergraduate came into full recognition in the University organization, and it was Professor Gildersleeve's Greek Seminary which domesticated in this country the method of classical research then prevalent in the great Universities of Germany.

But, while Professor Gildersleeve's Seminary got its inspiration, and, to some extent, its method from Germany, it was never completely German in its conduct. This would have been impossible under a man endowed with his temperament and his personality. A profound admirer as he was of the thoroughness and the extent of German scholarship, it was much more than this that he gave to his students.

I was not a member of the earliest group of students that gathered around him in the first few years of his work at The Johns Hopkins University (the Fellows during the first year were Charles R. Lanman, Walter Hines Page, A. Duncan Savage, Ernest G. Sihler, and John H. Wheeler). I entered the Seminary in 1883, but its characteristics in my time were the same as they had been in earlier days. Archaeology had not yet reared its head, and the chief business of those who joined the Greek Seminary was Greek.

All the graduate work in Greek was conducted by Professor Gildersleeve. The Greek Seminary met then five days a week, one hour each day. Two of the five hours were devoted to interpretations by the

members of the Seminary, one hour to lectures by the Director (in 1883, on Greek Historiography); the remaining two hours were spent on Greek composition and translation. In these last two hours Professor Gildersleeve devoted himself mainly to syntax. There was, accordingly, no question with the students of divided interest; if they came to The Johns Hopkins University to study Greek, they came to study with Professor Gildersleeve, and, when they emerged, they emerged as Gildersleevians in the fullest meaning of the term.

If Professor Gildersleeve had been a less gifted man, this might have been a disadvantage, for then there might have been danger of narrow specialization, but, as it was, this danger was obviated by his unique personality and influence.

In no respect was Professor Gildersleeve a systematic teacher. In fact, in the narrow sense of the word he was no teacher at all. While always open to consultation, he never invited it, and was rarely consulted, and no one was ever less a haven to the idle or inefficient student.

The business of the Greek Seminary was largely in the hands of the Senior Fellow, and the leonine figure at the end of the table sat as a critic, not as a helper. While uniformly patient with the halting performances of his followers, he never supplied a student with ideas or did his work for him. The student felt, immediately upon contact with him, that the responsibility for his work lay with himself, that his work must be done by himself. Professor Gildersleeve did not give him any suggestions as to method, did not supply him with bibliography, did not examine his interpretation in advance of presentation and straighten out vexed questions. The student had to stand alone. When the interpretation was read, the critic would listen attentively, comment where comment seemed desirable, seize opportunities for correction or for wider treatment, based upon complete command of the material, but he rarely passed judgment; he left the student to discover the inadequacies of his work from his experiences before the class.

In the general lectures, too, Professor Gildersleeve was far from systematic. Completeness had no charm for him; the immature criticism of the ordinary dissertation he abhorred. He spoke upon the points that appealed to him most, and it was at once evident that the mechanics of learning had little interest for him. It was the living spirit of literature that spoke to him; it was this living spirit he interpreted to his students.

In his lectures on Greek Syntax he came nearest to being systematic, and it was in these that he made his profoundest impression. In the case of many of his

students this impression led to statistical investigation of syntactical phenomena, but such study was only designed to furnish proof of what the master's genius had already divined. To him language was alive; it was the expression of the soul of man, and the Greek language, as the embodiment of the Greek soul, was the finest achievement of humanity. Any attempt to interpret language as a lifeless machine met with his supreme scorn. On the other hand, any shallow or cheap sentimentality in linguistic interpretation was equally distasteful to him. His interest here, as in the case of literature, was in the Greek spirit, and with this by natural endowment he was one in sympathy and understanding; of this he was the revealer and the interpreter.

To say that all his students became sharers in these mysteries would be to overstate the fact. But there was no one who failed to get at least a far-off glimpse of the heights, and this was in itself a stately vision.

The great gift that he bestowed upon his pupils, was therefore, inspiration, the appreciation of the fact that literature is an art, not a handicraft, and that the masterpieces of the Greek literature embodied in the Greek language are in their way as divine as the masterpieces of Greek sculpture, that they make their appeal to our spirits, and must be interpreted by our imaginations.

I hope I may be permitted a personal addition. In the early nineties I became associated with Professor Gildersleeve in his linguistic work, and for thirty years I enjoyed the inestimable privilege of intimate personal relationship with him. The remembrance of this time is a precious possession. He was to me a genial companion, a sympathetic critic, an interested adviser, a stimulating coworker, and a loyal friend; in a word, he was to me—the Master.

GONZALEZ LODGE

CICERO'S ATTITUDE TO THE CONFLICT OF 49 B. C.

The more one seeks to know the man, Cicero, and to envisage that stormy period in which he lived, the less satisfying appears the common view of his vacillating attitude at the beginning of the Civil War. It does not seem reasonable that a person so intelligent and, at the same time, so sensitive to moral obligation should prove merely pusillanimous in one of the great crises of his mature life.

As one reads letters written by him in the closing weeks of the year 50 B. C., when the storm was impending, and in the opening weeks of 49 B. C., after the tempest broke, one is impressed by the clearness and the positiveness of his estimate of the situation, and no less impressed by his consistent reiteration of this estimate and of what he conceives his personal duty to be.

It would not have been strange if his first utterances had been vague or if he had soon reversed a position taken at the outset; for he had left Rome for his distant province, Cilicia, early in May in the year

51 B. C., and not until late November of the following year did he reach Brundisium on the return journey. It was January 4, 49 B. C., before he actually arrived at Rome.

Notwithstanding this long absence from the capital, Cicero has hardly landed in Italy before he announces that, if the matter comes to a vote, he will adhere to Pompey's side¹. His decision rests on two grounds—a moral obligation to support the person who has befriended him², and the fact that Pompey represents the *bona causa*, the cause of constitutional government, while Caesar is the lawless leader of the most lawless elements in the State³.

From the beginning Cicero also reiterates his opinion that an armed conflict between these two citizens must be avoided⁴, for the chances of success lie with Caesar⁵, who is prepared to fight, while Pompey is not. I see nothing to indicate that in thus counselling the avoidance of war Cicero was moved by anything but a sane judgment of actual conditions and a sincere patriotism. In the one passage which might be interpreted as indicating cowardice he asks Atticus's advice on the general situation, and adds⁶: 'For my part I do not cease to urge peace, which, even though it be an unjust peace, is more advantageous than a most just war with fellow-citizens'. I do not understand this to mean that Cicero favors the general principle of 'peace at any price' any more than he intends to ascribe such sentiments to Cato when he writes⁷ on the very next day:

'... After reaching Capua yesterday I met the consuls and many men of our order. All desired Caesar to stand by the terms which he had proposed and to withdraw his garrisons. Favonius was the only one who did not like conditions to be imposed upon us by Caesar, but he was not listened to in the council. For even Cato himself by this time prefers slavery to war <Cato enim ipse iam servire quam pugnare mavult>'.

It was an immediate conflict which they feared, against a leader who would stop at nothing in accomplishing his ends, who was prepared to fight, as they were not⁸, and whose cruelty in victory, as Cicero mistakenly believed, would be on a tremendous scale⁹. Moreover, it was civil war which they faced¹⁰; that challenge honorable men will not take up until every effort at reconciliation has failed.

Because of his eager desire for peace Cicero is early regarded as a possible mediator¹¹. That such a rôle should appeal to him is easily explained. It was not merely in harmony with selfish interests and with that weaker side of his nature which often led him to put an absurdly high value on positions of influence; it was also the result of certain better qualities. With his keen mind and his judicial training he was always looking at both sides of a question. The man with whom that is habitual will never be a good

¹7.3.5 (December 9, 50 B. C.)—Unless it is otherwise specified, references in these footnotes are to Cicero, *Ad Atticum*.
²7.6.2. ³7.3.2-5 (December 9, 50 B. C.); compare 9.19.1; 10.8.1-2.
⁴7.3.5; 7.5.5. ⁵7.3.5. ⁶7.14.3 (January 25, 49 B. C.).
⁷7.15.2. ⁸7.15.3; 7.20.1. ⁹7.7.7; 7.12.2; 7.22.1; 8.9.4.
¹⁰8.11 D.7.

¹¹Ad *Familiares* 16.2.2; *Ad Atticum* 8.15 A.1-2; 9.11.2.

partisan; he will not cut a heroic figure where the issues are involved.

And certainly never was there a crisis in history less calculated to arouse the enthusiastic championship of thoughtful men for either side. Cicero had two interviews¹² with Pompey in December, 50 B. C., in the second of which Pompey seemed to inspire him with admiration and confidence, but this is the last time in Pompey's life when Cicero's expressions of confidence are not qualified; indeed, he soon reaches a point where he feels only disapproval and distrust of the policies of his leader. About the middle of January, 49 B. C., he writes to Atticus¹³:

' . . . What plan our Gnaeus has formed or is forming I do not know; so far he is cooped up in the towns and in a state of lethargy. If he makes a stand in Italy, we shall all be together; but, if he withdraws, our course is a matter for deliberation. So far, unless I am mad, he has done everything stupidly and rashly'.

On February 17 he says¹⁴:

' . . . It seems to me that never in any nation has any statesman and leader acted more basely than has our friend. I grieve for him; he abandoned Rome, that is, his country, for which and in which it would have been glorious to die'.

He is indescribably shocked¹⁵ at Pompey's treatment of Domitius in the Corfinium affair.

' . . . One thing¹⁶ remains to complete the disgrace of our friend—that is, a failure to relieve Domitius. "But", you say, "no one doubts that he will go to his aid". I think not. "Will he then desert such a fellow-citizen and those who you know are with him, especially when he has thirty cohorts himself?" Unless all signs deceive me, he will. He is incredibly frightened. He sees nothing but flight, in which you think—for I see what your feeling is—that I ought to be his companion. Indeed I have someone to flee from but no one to follow. As for your praising what I said and declaring it to be memorable—that I preferred to be conquered with Pompey rather than to conquer with your Caesarians—I do indeed prefer it, but with the Pompey as he then was or as he seemed to me; with this other Pompey who flees before he knows from whom or whither, who has surrendered our interests, abandoned his country and is abandoning Italy, that which I preferred is happening—I am conquered'.

Again, he writes¹⁷ of Pompey's selfish ambitions:

' . . . Nor did he leave the city because he could not protect it, nor Italy because he was driven out, but this has been his plan from the first, to stir up every land and sea, to rouse barbarian princes, to bring armed into Italy fierce tribes, to collect great armies. For a long time he has been aiming at that kind of dominion which Sulla had, and many of his companions desire it'.

But, after all this is granted, it remains that Caesar is worse, and Pompey represents the *causa publica*, even if he has mismanaged shockingly¹⁸ above all, Cicero cannot endure the ignominy of seeming to be unfaithful to one who has aided him in trouble¹⁹. His repeated allusions to the great *beneficium* do credit to his fine sense of honor, but one cannot help feeling that he greatly overrated his friend's service and that Antony's estimate of Pompey as²⁰ 'the man who first

did Cicero an injury that he might do him a favor, is more accurate than Cicero's, though less gentlemanly.

From Cicero's first declaration concerning his duty of adherence to Pompey he never wavers. The question on which he does waver is one which arises later and is a question of policy rather than of principle—whether he shall follow Pompey to Greece or shall remain in Italy on the chance of being able to effect the longed-for reconciliation. When he learns that Pompey has left Brundisium, Cicero is full of remorse and shame²¹ that he has not gone too. But he had started to join Pompey at Luccia and had found the way blocked²² by Caesar's advance from the north.

After Pompey has sailed away, Cicero torments himself with arguments *pro* and *con* as to his duty. The departure from Italy was the last step in a course which Cicero had disapproved from start to finish²³. This disapproval he seems to have expressed whenever Pompey asked his advice, but that did not happen often, perhaps because of the difficulties of communication after Pompey left Rome, especially after he reached Brundisium. A letter written by Pompey while he was still at Canusium in February was, apparently, seven days in reaching Cicero in Formiae²⁴.

Cicero was too honest not to face the fact that it would be disadvantageous to him personally to follow Pompey. Indeed, he says he was openly threatened to this effect; but he adds²⁵, 'I did not so much fear these threats if I had to meet them—I thought I ought to avoid them, if I could do so honorably'.

Pompey left Brundisium on March 17, and it was not until June 7 that Cicero followed him. The reasons for his delay seem to have been chiefly three.

(1) The first reason was the influence of Atticus. As we read the letters in chronological order, Atticus seems all along to have agreed that Cicero's place was with Pompey, until March 7²⁶, when he appears to have changed his mind. However, in a letter²⁷ written a little later, Cicero says that he has been looking over his correspondence files and he finds as early as January 21 a letter in which Atticus had said (9.10.4): ' . . . But let us see what Gnaeus is doing and whither his plans tend. If he leaves Italy, he will be acting altogether wrongly and, I think, unwisely; but it will be time enough to change our plans then'. Again, on January 23 he had written (§ 4): 'If Gnaeus withdraws from Italy, I think you should go back to Rome; for what would be the end of following him abroad?' On February 7 Atticus had concluded another letter with these words (§ 5):

' . . . For my part I do not advise your fleeing too, if Pompey leaves Italy. You will do this at the risk of very great danger and you will not at all benefit the State, which you will be able to help later, if you remain'.

And so on, through February and March Atticus was steadily urging (§§ 5-10) one of his characteristically cautious conclusions, into which undoubtedly entered a

¹²7.4; 7.8. ¹³7.10. ¹⁴8.2.2. ¹⁵8.7; 8.8.2; 8.9.3.
¹⁶8.7.1-2. ¹⁷8.11.2; compare 9.10.2. ¹⁸9.1.4; 9.7.4.
¹⁹8.1.4; 8.15.2; 9.7.4 (end). ²⁰10.8 A.2.

²¹9.6.4-end; 9.10.2. ²²8.11 D.1-5; 9.2 A.2.
²³8.3.3-5; 8.11 D.6-7. ²⁴8.11 D.4.
²⁵8.11 D.7. ²⁶9.2. ²⁷9.10.

deep concern for the personal interests of himself and his friend. Why this change in the tone of Atticus's advice had not impressed Cicero more before the actual crisis of Pompey's departure arose we do not know; I suspect that Cicero was still so confident of the success of his efforts at mediation that Atticus's alarm failed to penetrate his optimism.

(2) The second influence contributing to Cicero's hesitation was the cleverly wielded influence of the Caesarians.

Caesar himself is careful not to break with Cicero³⁸; he makes plain the fact that he is pleased that Cicero remains neutral in action, if not in feeling³⁹. Soon after driving Pompey from Brundisium he requests Cicero to meet him in Rome and give him the benefit of his advice, and his resources⁴⁰. On his journey to Rome he arranges for an interview with Cicero at Formiae. At this meeting Cicero conducts himself with great dignity and firmness, if we may trust his own account in a letter to Atticus⁴¹:

'... I was mistaken in thinking he would be easy to deal with. I have never experienced anything less so. He said that my decision amounted to a condemnation of him and that others would be slower if I did not come to Rome. I said that their case was different from mine. After long discussion he said, "Well, come then and discuss the question of peace". "According to my own unhampered judgment?", I asked. "Should I try to prescribe to you?", he answered. "Well, then", said I, "I shall speak along this line, that the Senate does not approve an expedition to Spain or sending an army to Greece and I shall express sorrow about Pompey". Thereupon he remarked, "Of course, I do not want that sort of thing said". "So I thought", said I, "but I do not wish to be present for that reason, because either I must say this and many similar things which I could not pass over in silence, if I were there, or I cannot come". The outcome of the matter was that by way of ending the interview he begged me to think the matter over'.

After some comments on the type of men who were in Caesar's retinue, Cicero adds (§ 3):

'... His last remark—I almost omitted it—was very unpleasant, that, if he could not have the benefit of my advice, he would take what he *could* get and stop at nothing'.

Too late Cicero sees that Caesar's object has probably been not to make peace but to gain time; to keep Cicero neutral, since he could not win his active support; to destroy Pompey by this negative policy as well as by the positive policy of conquest in Spain. That Cicero was slow to see this is not strange: hard-hearted indeed must one have been to resist the charm of that delightful courtesy with which Caesar appeared to cast himself so completely on the wisdom and the resources of Cicero.

Furthermore, these advances of Caesar were supplemented by the efforts of his friends. Not only were Caelius⁴² and Antony⁴³ urging Cicero not to incur the anger of Caesar by joining Pompey; but neutrality with a view to mediation was the advice of Balbus⁴⁴, who, like Cicero, felt an obligation to Pompey. Matius⁴⁵, in an interview about March 20, seems not to

have doubted that a reconciliation was still possible⁴⁶.

About a week after the interview at Formiae, Caesar wrote pardoning Cicero's refusal to come to his Senate, and professing⁴⁷ not to take it at all amiss, but, on April 16, as he is journeying to Spain, he writes a letter⁴⁸ which Cicero must have found galling in the extreme. It amounts to a command not to abandon the policy of neutrality. At about this time Cicero becomes conscious that he is being watched, that he is not expected to leave Italy. Indeed, Antony as propraetor of Italy gradually discloses to Cicero⁴⁹ the fact that Caesar will not give him permission to leave the country.

(3) The third important reason for Cicero's delay in joining Pompey was consideration for his family⁵⁰, for the future of his son, which would be imperilled by Cicero's adherence to what might prove the losing side, and for Tullia, always dearer than life to her father, and at this time a special source of anxiety because of her delicate health⁵¹.

Cicero left Italy on June 7, 49 B. C., and there are no letters in his correspondence until January, 48 B. C. Not until July, 48 B. C., do we get any expression of opinion from him about Pompey's camp. Then it is an expression of disappointment with things there and of apparent regret that he had ever come⁵².

Plutarch⁵³ gives us an inkling of what happened in the interval left blank by the letters:

'... But when Caesar set out for Spain, Cicero at once⁵⁴ sailed to Pompey. The rest of Pompey's followers were glad to see him but, when Cato saw him, he privately blamed him much for attaching himself to Pompey. In his own case, Cato said, it was not honorable to abandon the line of public policy which he had chosen from the beginning; but Cicero, though he was of more service to his country and his friends if he remained at home without taking sides and accommodated himself to the issue of events, without any reason and under no compulsion had made himself the enemy of Caesar and had come thither to share in their great danger.'

It is of no little significance that a man of Cato's stamp found nothing to condemn in Cicero's neutrality; that, on the contrary, he regarded as very real the service which Cicero might even yet render his country if he maintained that neutrality of action.

Plutarch goes on to say:

'... By these words <of Cato> the purpose of Cicero was upset, as well as by the fact that Pompey made no great use of him. But he was himself to blame for this, since he made no denial that he was sorry he had come, made light of Pompey's preparations and showed a lurking displeasure at his plans, and did not refrain from jests and witty remarks about his comrades in arms.'

Thus, Cicero's part in the conflict of 49 B. C. forms a sorry chapter in the story of his life. He becomes quite disillusioned about a man who had been his ideal

³⁸8.2. ³⁹8.11.5. ³⁹9.16.3. ³⁹9.18.1. ⁴⁰Ad Fam. 8.16.

³⁹10.8 A. ⁴⁰8.15 A.1-2. ³⁹9.11.2.

⁴¹10.3 A.2. ³⁹10.8 B. ³⁹10.10.1-2. ⁴⁰10.8 A.1; Ad Fam. 8.16.1.

⁴²10.18.1. ⁴³11.4.

⁴⁴Life of Cicero, 38 (I have used the Loeb translation).

⁴⁵Caesar had set out for Spain in April, 49 B. C. Cicero did not sail for Greece until the following June.

for many years. His own great anxieties and sacrifices appear in the end only futile. If he erred in going to Pompey, it was, at any rate, a somewhat noble error; and yet it was too reluctantly done to have the air of noble action. This delay was not due to cowardice, but, at first, to circumstances over which he had no control and, then, to the fact that the right was so inextricably bound up with a multitude of undesirable things as to bewilder the judgment of the wisest men at Rome.

VASSAR COLLEGE

CATHARINE SAUNDERS

VERGIL AND HECTOR BERLIOZ

Lovers of music, who have had the high good fortune to hear the *Damnation de Faust* of the French composer, Hector Berlioz, will have their curiosity fired to become better acquainted with the life story of this temperamental genius. Fortunately, we have readily accessible, in the *Everyman Library*, *The Life of Hector Berlioz*, containing his memoirs and letters—a story more fascinating than that of Benvenuto Cellini. Of particular interest to the student of the Classics is his account of the influence of the reading of Vergil's *Aeneid* on his sensitive young soul (4-5).

Indulgent as my father was over my work, yet, for a long while, he was unable to make me love the classics. It seemed impossible to me to concentrate my thoughts long enough to learn by heart a few lines of Horace and Vergil; impatient of the beaten track my wayward mind flew off to the entrancing unknown world of the atlas. . . .

Berlioz writes then of his passion for books of travel, and takes up once more the account of his classical studies.

. . . However, in the end the love of poetry and appreciation of its beauty awoke in me. The first spark of passion that fired my heart and imagination was kindled by Virgil's magnificent epic, and I well remember how my voice broke as I tried to construe aloud the fourth book of the *Aeneid*. One day, stumbling along, I came to the passage where Dido—the presents of Aeneas heaped around her—gives up her life upon the funeral pyre; the agony of the dying queen, the cries of her sister, her nurse, her women; the horror of that scene that struck pity even to the hearts of the Immortals, all rose so vividly before me that my lips trembled, my words came more and more indistinctly, at the line

Quaesivit coelo lucem ingemuitque reperta¹,
I stopped dead.

Then my dear father's delicate tact stepped in. Apparently noticing nothing he said gently: "That will do for today, my boy; I am tired". And I tore away to give vent to my Virgilian misery unmolested.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,
NEW YORK CITY

ELI EDWARD BURRISS

THE LITERARY INSPIRATION OF BOTTICELLI, PALLAS AND A CENTAUR

Undergraduates reading Homer for the first time are, I find, frequently struck by the strangeness of one detail in the account of the fatal quarrel in *Iliad* 1. Achilles, on the point of avenging Agamemnon's insult to his honor, is restrained from untoward violence

by the interference of Pallas Athena, who from behind seizes him by the hair, whereupon, like the Elephant's Child in Kipling's story, he was very much astonished—not without reason. The gesture of the goddess is to some funny, to others grotesque and bald, but always it is very vivid, as doubtless Homer intended it should be (1.197).

Every time that I read the passage, Athena's gesture reminds me of the pose of the allegorical figure of Pallas in Botticelli's painting, *Pallas and a Centaur*, in the Pitti Palace. This picture shows against a distant view of curving coastline, meant probably to represent the Bay of Naples, Pallas Athena in the garb of peace, her head and person wreathed in olive leaves; the only sign of her militant character is the long pike in her left hand. Her right hand is outstretched, and grasps a lock of hair on the top of the head of a centaur, who in complete submission and dejection stands beside her, clinging to his useless bow.

This picture, an allegorical study of the power of mind over brute instincts, Botticelli is believed to have painted to commemorate the peace consummated in 1480 between Florence and Naples by the diplomatic visit of Lorenzo dei Medici to the South. The figure of Pallas, the fabric of whose robe bears the decorative device of sets of three rings or balls, a detail from the coat of arms of the Medici family, is most obviously a personification of Medician wisdom, which, to subdue the beast, has only to manifest itself. The centaur is taken to be in general an embodiment of the ignoble in the enemies of Florence; specifically the hybrid monster represents the alliance between Pope Sixtus IV and Ferdinand I, King of Naples, which endangered the welfare of the State of Florence. In the background of the picture rides a ship, presumably a vivid shorthand symbol of Lorenzo's journeying.

The painting has been classed among Botticelli's mythological studies, but apparently this classification has been dependent on identification of the two figures separately, a centaur and a *<Greek>* goddess. I suggest that, even as *The Birth of Venus* owes some inspiration to the pictorial quality of Lucretius, 1.7-13—

tibi suavis daedala tellus
summittit flores, tibi rident aequora ponti
placatumque nitet diffuso lumine caelum,
nam simul ac species patefactast verna diei
et reserata viget genitabilis aura favoni,
aeriae primum volucres te, diva, tuumque
significant initum percuscae corda tua vi—

so Pallas and a Centaur may be inspired by the passage quoted above from *Iliad* 1. The Homeric analogy may be enlarged by the consideration that it was from Chiron the centaur that Achilles received his early training and education.

It has frequently been pointed out that Botticelli was peculiarly qualified to illustrate the mythological and the allegorical tendencies which the revival of the Classics developed in Italy in the fifteenth century. As Pater says of *The Birth of Venus*, we know far more than Botticelli about the Greeks, but from his pictures

better than anywhere else we get a record of the "first vivid impression made by the Hellenic spirit on minds turned back toward it in almost painful aspiration from a world in which it had been so long ignored".

I have never seen, in any annotated edition of the *Iliad* or in any critical work on Botticelli, any suggestion of this possible Homeric inspiration of Pallas and a Centaur, and I, accordingly, take this opportunity of publishing the suggestion for whatever it may be worth.

SMITH COLLEGE

ELEANOR FERGUSON RAMBO

REVIEWS

Recueil Milliet: Textes Grecs et Latins Relatifs à l'Histoire de la Peinture Ancienne, Publiés, Traduits et Commentés sous le Patronage de l'Association des Études Grecques. Par Adolphe Reinach. Tome I. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck (1921). Pp. VIII + 429.

The occasion of this book was Paul Milliet's inability to use the ancient languages. Their use might have been of prime importance to him, since he had the instincts, if not the training, of a classical archaeologist. Overbeck's excellent *Schriftquellen* was practically of no use to Milliet. At the close of 1905, therefore, he gave a fund to the Association des Études Grecques for the purpose of publishing a new collection of texts dealing with ancient art, which, with complete translations and full comment, should replace Overbeck's book. The latter has neither translation nor comment.

The pathetic thing in connection with the proposed work is that, although Milliet was then sixty-two years old and desired to see the work put through during his life, the Association, or those in charge of the publication, so procrastinated that it was not until 1911 that the work was put in the hands of the brilliant young scholar, Adolphe Reinach, nephew of the distinguished Solomon Reinach.

At the time he undertook the task this remarkable young Frenchman was but twenty-four. With such prodigious enthusiasm and persistence, however, did he work that, at the time he was killed in the war, in August, 1914, the material was in such condition that his uncle, after peace was signed, was able to prepare the work for publication.

Meanwhile Milliet had died, in 1918.

The present volume deals only with painting. The remaining parts will treat of architecture, sculpture, gems, etc. When they will come out no one knows.

Excellent as is Overbeck's *Schriftquellen* from the point of view of completeness of material, and possible as it is to find abundant modern material dealing with painting in antiquity, Milliet's *Recueil* will prove to be a boon by the sheer fact that it gathers into compact space, together with the texts, an intelligent digest of, and explanation of, the material handled by the ancient writers.

Not only that, but the book is neatly arranged so that the different aspects of ancient painting may be discovered at a glance. The texts are grouped under

the following headings: Technique of Ancient Painting, Aesthetics of Ancient Painting, The Beginnings of Painting in Greece, Polygnotus and the First Athenian School, The Classical School, The Sicyonian School, The Theban School of the Fourth Century, The Attic School of the Fourth Century, Fourth Century Painters Attaching to the Attic School, Anonymous Paintings of the Fourth Century Attic School, The Apogee of Painting in the Period of Alexander and the Epigoni, and The Hellenistic Painting of the Third to the First Century. The volume is supplied also with a full index of artists' names.

VASSAR COLLEGE

OLIVER S. TONKS

Die Homerische Gleichnisse. By Hermann Fränkel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht (1921). Pp. V + 119. \$1.00.

This monograph is a study of the contents and the purpose of the Homeric similes, with only casual reference to their structure and their form. The author believes in the stratification of the Homeric poems, and is a Chorizont. Hence, for example, he regards as 'earlier' the similes in which the wild forces of nature are described, forgetting among other things the acute observation of Mure (*History of Greek Literature*, 2.67), that many similes of the *Iliad* which describe nature in commotion are closely paralleled by actual descriptions in the narrative of the *Odyssey*. Yet he 'rejects' few or none of the similes, and throughout is inclined to treat as a whole both the Homeric poems and the body of comparisons.

The work is divided into three parts. In the first (11-16) the author states his position. He opposes, on the one hand, the theory that the similes have but one or two 'points of comparison', regarding this view as too rationalistic. He thus takes issue with Professor Shorey (*The Logic of the Homeric Simile, Classical Philology* 17.240-259 [October, 1922]); in fact a later note (105), to the effect that Homer was influenced least of all poets by logic and causality, seems almost to have been directed in advance against Professor Shorey's article. On the other hand, the author also rejects the view of Plüss, that the similes are used chiefly or solely to suggest the mood of the action or of the characters. He himself holds the middle ground; in fact, he occupies all the territory between the two extreme views, as he explains in the third part of his work (97-114). The purpose of the Homeric simile is not one, but manifold—nearly a dozen purposes are suggested without exhausting the possibilities (99).

The body of the brochure (16-97) is devoted to an interpretation of the similes, arranged in eleven groups according to theme. The author believes in a long development from a short typical comparison, e. g. as swift 'as a horse', here agreeing with Mulder (Shorey as cited above, 251). So he thinks that fully to understand the force of any comparison we must consider all the others which take the same theme; we can, as it were, construct the family tree of the several

types. As a corollary to this theory similes whose family trees are most fully developed are 'earlier', and those which spring into being ready-made are 'late'.

In his interpretations the author tries to 'glue the simile to the narrative'—against Eustathius (compare the reviewer's note, *Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 51.xiii); so, on page 105, he says, 'The more detailed the comparison, the greater value as a simile is it inclined to have'. In other words, Herr Fränkel tries to interpret what the reviewer has characterized as "overtones". This is open to the objection which the reviewer has pointed out (*The Function of the Homeric Simile*, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 52.132-147), that the poet can never awaken in his listeners or in any one listener exactly the same mental picture that is in his own fancy or the same sensuous reaction. Hence Herr Fränkel's interpretations suffer from a transcendentalism which too often interferes with their value. But, whether or not one accepts the author's view—as the reviewer, for reasons which are sufficiently indicated in the article just referred to, cannot do—that the whole of the long-tailed simile has the same sort of function as the shorter comparison, the interpretations which the author spreads over some eighty pages form a commentary on perhaps 1,000 verses of the Iliad and the Odyssey which is of distinct value in Homeric study. And adequate indices make the comments readily available. The author is thoroughly familiar with his material, and is sympathetic in his treatment; and his thesis is so broad in its scope that it does not fetter his mental reaction to Homer's pictures. To illustrate, we may mention the suggestion—which the author is inclined to push too far, we think—that the scenes described in some of the similes are meant to be viewed *from above* (see pages 22, 31-32, 52), in fact from the home of the gods. Why not rather from the top of one of the 'lonely mountains' that the poet loved so well (compare page 138 of the reviewer's article cited above)? But the suggestion of the author might well be made the starting-point of a new examination of the Homeric similes.

Herr Fränkel continually refers to Dr. Leaf's comments on the Iliad, and he knows Professor Platt's contribution to our knowledge of the Homeric simile. But, if he were familiar with the work of Professor Scott, he would not have affirmed that there is no season of the year in the Iliad and that it is winter in the Odyssey.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres—1923¹
Q. Geminus Sabinus, Princeps Peregrinorum, Louis Poinsot and Raymond Lantier [two new inscriptions found at Henchir-Ksour-Dzemda, in Tunisia]; Vénus et Mars sur des Intailles Magiques et Autres, Adrien Blanchet; Analyse d'une Lettre de M.

Picard, Directeur de l'École Française d'Athènes, sur la Découverte à Délos des Tombeaux des Vierges Hyperboréennes, M. Homolle; Découverte d'un Autel Taurobolique à Rome, Franz Cumont.

Anglican Theological Review—October, St. Augustine's Doctrine of the State in Relation to Some Modern Theories of Sovereignty, Arthur Adams [compares the effect produced on the minds of men by the sack of Rome, which occasioned the writing of St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, with that produced by the Great War; and examines "the question of the relation of Church and State, as Augustine conceived them, in terms of modern political philosophy"]. Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester, England—Jan., 1923, Where Was Vergil's Farm?, R. S. Conway [an important article, in favor of Mr. G. E. K. Brauholtz's view that Andes should be identified, not with Pietole, but with Calvisano. Dr. Conway bases his conclusion on evidence furnished by several inscriptions, by Probus's Life of Vergil, and by the five "local eclogues"—the odd-numbered Eclogues—notably 1 and 9. There are also notes on the Life of Vergil attributed to Probus, and on the events underlying Eclogues 1 and 9].

Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société D'Anthropologie de Paris—1922 (published in 1923), Sur la Conception Ancienne—Anatomique, Physiologique, et Psychique—du Muscle Diaphragme [deals particularly with Greek ideas on the subject, especially in regard to the use of the word *φρένες*].

Educational Review—Nov., The Place of Ancient History in the Curriculum, Elizabeth McConathy [*"We are now citizens of the world"* and must therefore "educate that part of our population which is willing and able to take serious thought for our government and world standing, in the origins and historical development of the races and present nations of the world"].

Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen—April-June, Review, unfavorable, by A. Lörcher, of John A. Scott, The Unity of Homer [the reviewer bitterly accuses the author of lack of understanding, and of narrow-mindedness, and defends the German critical scholars against the Unitarians. For a review, favorable, by D. M. Robinson, of Professor Scott's book, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.212-214]; Review, favorable, by K. Sethe, of Ulrich Wilcken, Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit]; Review, by Max Pohlenz, of Gilbert Norwood, Greek Tragedy [the author is reproached on the ground that he lacks knowledge of Wilamowitz and is too ready to follow Verrall, but some good points in his work are recognized].

Isis—1923, Volume V, Part III, Fourteenth Critical Bibliography of the History and Philosophy of Science and of the History of Civilization [this remarkable summary is arranged in three classifications, chronological, historical, and topical, with brief but valuable notes on many of the works cited].

Journal des Savants—May-June, L'Intervention Romaine dans l'Orient Hellénique, Jerome Carcopino

[review, of Maurice Holleaux, *Rome, La Grèce et Les Monarchies Hellénistiques au IIIe Siècle avant J.-C.*; Review, by A. Constans, of Dominique Mallet, *Les Rapports des Grecs avec l'Égypte*; Review, by R. Cagnat, of J. H. Holwerda, Arentsburg, een Romeinsch Militair Vlootstation bij Voorburg ['a very careful work']. Arentsburg is particularly interesting because it is the site of a canal between the Rhine and the Meuse mentioned by Tacitus, *Ann. II. 201*; Review, by Louis Brehier, of William Miller, *Essays on the Latin Orient* [characterized as a collection of monographs not constituting connected history, but giving a wealth of information on interesting episodes]; Review, by A. M., of P. Pedrizet, *Negotium Perambulans in Tenebris, Études de Démonologie Gréco-Orientale*.

Rendiconti della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche, e Filologiche—July, *La Città Campagna delle "Saturae" di Petronio*, Italo Sgobbo [the author would identify this city with Puteoli rather than with Naples or with Cumae].

Revue Universitaire—Oct., *Vieux Cahiers, Vieux Livres, Jeunes Classes*, F. Gaiffe [the author seems to regret the reestablishment in France of the Classics as obligatory, and to prefer the so-called reforms of 1902, just terminated, since a smaller selected group will, he thinks, naturally succeed better with the Classics than will the general rank and file. He compares favorably with his own classically-trained generation the results obtained by the teachers and students of to-day, basing his comments on an exceptionally excellent group of students under his own observation, who average higher in Latin and Greek, and are taught more sensibly in French composition, than his own classmates were. Latin text-books, too, he believes, have improved]; *La Réforme de l'Enseignement Secondaire devant la Chambre* (Mai-Juillet, 1923), Maurice Lacroix [report of the debate, covering twenty sessions, which resulted in the success of M. Bérard, Minister of Public Instruction, who fought for unified Elementary education with an important and obligatory part assigned to Latin. The minority consisted of two opposing camps: (1) partisans of 'dualism', a choice between training in modern languages and training in ancient languages, from the start; (2) partisans of complete unity, in Secondary as well as in Elementary education, with ancient languages playing the large rôle. The latter group included the Socialists, who opposed the alleged 'money frontier' which would deprive poor children of classical culture].

Scandinavian Scientific Review—Plato's *Symposium*, Aug. Bjarnason [an answer to an article by Harold Höffding. The writer recalls Plato's view that the feelings keep pace with the development of "ideational" life, and that one may thus mount from simplest to highest conceptions. The modern psychologists agree with Plato that "if an instinct is displaced or hindered in its development, it will lead

to perversity or neurosis, but, if it is allowed to unfold itself in a healthy and socially acknowledged manner, it will probably lead to one or another kind of sublimation"].

School and Society—Nov. 10, Latin as a Preparation for French, Thomas J. Kirby [report of a special investigation of the American Classical League].

Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften—1923, Alexander der Grosse und die Indischen Gymnosophisten, Ulrich Wilcken.

La Vie Universitaire—June, *La Réforme de l'Enseignement*, Georges Leygues <a speech by the former President of the Council of Public Instruction, defending the reforms of 1902, and maintaining (1) that these were not inimical to the Classics, since Latin was obligatory in three out of four sections, and (2) that those reforms produced students of excellent scholarship and character. Though Greek and Latin culture has a high educational value, the Latin ideal, the author maintains, does not suffice for the twentieth century and Republican France. Roman domination did not have a salutary effect even on Gaul; and French culture is far superior to that of classical antiquity; hence why study the latter? One can write French correctly, or enjoy French tragedy, without a knowledge of Latin and Greek. Modern languages and sciences have a highly important practical value, as the World War revealed. It is unfair to force all alike to follow the same curriculum <M. Leygues ignores the possibility of making a choice after the first four years>. There is danger of establishment of a caste system, on the basis of a knowledge of Latin <yet the Socialists favored compulsory Latin all the way—see the summary, above, of the article by M. Lacroix in the *Revue Universitaire*>. M. Leygues exalts the utilitarian, and maintains that the majority of Schoolmen oppose the new change. He concludes that the question must be considered from the political and economic, not from the pedagogical, point of view <it seems to me that here lies precisely one of the M. Leygues's main weaknesses>]; M. Leon Bérard Modifie par un Décret, le Régime de l'Enseignement [includes a copy of the decree, the most interesting details of which are as follows: All students are to study Latin for four years, and Greek for the last two of these years; at the end of this period they are to decide whether in the remaining two classes they will study Latin <with either Greek or Modern Languages>, or Modern Languages exclusively. Candidates who wish to register for the 'Bacca-lauréat' <given in recognition of so-called Secondary education> must pass preliminary examinations in Greek and Latin, and in these subjects only. M. Bérard stresses the danger of subordinating the conditions of intellectual culture to material progress or economic necessity, and points out that France, after her great losses, must train men capable, in culture and character, of surmounting the country's great difficulties.